

thing standing in the way is the Republican Senate majority. In a moment, I will, once again, ask consent that the Senate set a time for a vote on the House bill to provide \$2,000 checks to the American people. Remember, the Democrats are willing to vote on all of the other issues that the Republicans say the President supposedly cares about. Just let us vote on a clean bill with the \$2,000 checks.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 645, H.R. 9051, a bill to increase the recovery rebate amounts to \$2,000 for individuals; that the bill be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage; and that if passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

WILLIAM M. (MAC) THORNBERRY
NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021—VETO—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the veto message on H.R. 6395, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message, a bill (H.R. 6395) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 9051 AND H.R. 6395

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, let me briefly respond to some of the points that Majority Leader MCCONNELL has made, to his inaccurate statements.

Now, I am delighted that, after years of talking on the floor of the Senate about socialism for the rich, apparently, that has gotten across to my Republican friends. Of course, that is what we do every single day. That is why we have the incredible level of income and wealth inequality that exists in this country, because, decade after decade, we have used this body to provide massive tax breaks to the rich and

provide corporate welfare to corporations that don't need it. That is socialism for the rich. The majority leader is right, but let's talk about, in fact, what is in this bill.

According to the Tax Policy Center, fewer than 1 percent of the benefits of the direct payments—that is the \$2,000 per working-class adult that Senator SCHUMER and I are talking about—would go to the top 5 percent of Americans. Virtually nothing would go to the very, very rich. The overwhelming majority of those funds would go to the middle class, the working class, low-income people, who in the midst of this pandemic are in desperate economic condition.

Again, I am delighted to hear the majority leader talking about socialism for the rich, and I hope we will continue that discussion in the next session. Let me talk about the socialism for the rich that the majority leader is enthusiastically supportive of as the majority leader helped to lead this body to pass Trump's tax bill.

Now, do you want to talk about socialism for the rich, Mr. Majority Leader?

Under that bill, Charles Koch—one of the very richest people in America, who has a net worth of \$113 billion—received a \$1.4 billion tax break.

Mr. Majority Leader, that sounds, to me, like socialism for the rich. Ah, but that is not all.

In Nevada, you have a gentleman named Sheldon Adelson, who is a major contributor to the Republican Party and a big funder for Donald Trump. Under that same tax bill led by the majority leader, Sheldon Adelson received a \$560 million tax break. A guy who is worth \$34 billion desperately needed that tax break of \$560 million.

Do you want more tax breaks for the rich? Do you want to talk about socialism for the rich?

Senator MCCONNELL had no problem giving a \$104 million tax refund to Amazon over the past 3 years despite the fact that the company made \$30 billion in profits. So the argument that this bill, in any significant way, benefits the rich is just not accurate, but let us talk about whom this bill does benefit.

This bill benefits tens of millions of Americans who, as a result of this pandemic, have lost their jobs and have lost their incomes. Some, in fact, have lost their lives. These are people who are going hungry today. We are seeing today a recordbreaking level of hunger in America—the richest country in the history of the world. All over this country—and I receive emails from people all over this country—people are frightened to death that they are going to be evicted from their homes. Think about what a \$4,000 check or a \$5,000 check would mean to those struggling families—husband, wife, kids. In fact, let me give you an example.

This is a problem taking place all over this country. It is taking place in Vermont. It is taking place in Senator

SCHUMER's State. It is taking place in Kentucky. In fact, the State of Kentucky—a very beautiful State; I have had the pleasure of being there a number of times—a beautiful State—is the State in which 10 out of the 25 poorest counties in America exist. I am sure Senator MCCONNELL is aware that, throughout his State, you have thousands and tens of thousands of people living in economic desperation. I am talking about counties where 30 to 40 percent of people are living in poverty and where many thousands of residents are trying to survive on less than \$20,000 a year.

I am just using Kentucky as an example because that is the State Senator MCCONNELL represents, but it is true all over this country.

In Kentucky, over 22 percent of the children are living in poverty. Do you think they might need a little bit of help?

In the State of Kentucky, more than 190,000 workers are making extremely low wages, and over a half a million people earn less than \$15 an hour. Somebody might want to ask those people what a \$2,000 check per adult would mean. I am talking about Kentucky, and I will never forget this because I visited Kentucky and talked to some of the people there. Kentucky has suffered from a particular opioid crisis. I will never forget talking to a football coach who told me that a bunch of the kids on his football team were living with their grandparents or on couches because of the opioid epidemic.

In other words, the people in Kentucky, the people in New York, and the people in Vermont are hurting. They need help.

So I say today to Senator MCCONNELL, the leader here, let us address the horrendous economic crisis facing tens of millions of Americans.

The pandemic today is worse than it has ever been. Hopefully, hopefully, the vaccine will make a profound difference, but, right now, people are hurting, and they are looking to this institution. They are looking to Congress. The House did the right thing. They are now looking to the Senate. They are looking to Senator MCCONNELL.

After all is said and done and after all of the legalese—and I am going to be introducing some legalese in a moment—it comes down to one thing: Senator MCCONNELL disagrees with the proposal that Senator SCHUMER and I are making. I got it. That is fine. This is a democracy. He has the right to his point of view. I would love to have the debate on the floor with Senator MCCONNELL about this legislation. All that we are asking is to give us the opportunity to vote up or down on whether or not working families in this country should be able to receive a \$2,000 check. Senator MCCONNELL disagrees.

Come to the floor. Tell us why you disagree. Then we will do what this institution is supposed to do. We will have a vote.

The truth is, in the House, Senator MCCONNELL knows that 44 Republicans voted for the House bill, which won, by the way, by a 2-to-1 majority. Two-thirds of the House voted to make sure that working Americans would get a \$2,000 check. Right here in the Senate, there are a number of Republicans—it is not clear how many—who have already gone public in saying they think it is a good idea that we go forward with the House bill.

So all that I am asking Senator MCCONNELL is to give us a vote. What is the problem? You can vote no. By the way, we need 60 votes—a majority. There is no question in my mind that a majority of the Senators will vote yes, but because of house rules, we need 60 votes. So we are going to have to get 48 Democrats—that is what we have—plus 12 Republicans. Can we get 12 Republicans? I don't know—maybe we can; maybe we can't—but give us a vote. What is the problem? What is the problem with having the American people see how their Senators vote on this issue of such enormous importance?

As Senator SCHUMER indicated, Senator MCCONNELL has some other concerns.

He is concerned about section 230 of the 1996 Federal Telecommunications Act. I am sure that this is absolutely on the minds of everybody in Vermont, in New York, and in Kentucky. It is probably all that they are talking about, the 1996 Telecommunications Act. Fine. If he wants a vote on that, bring it to the floor. Let's vote on it as a separate bill.

Do you want to talk about election security? Senator SCHUMER is right. There are a lot of issues out there. I am concerned about voter suppression. I am concerned about people waiting online for 5 hours to cast a vote. I am concerned about voter intimidation. Senator MCCONNELL has different points of view. Let's have that discussion. Put together a commission. No problem. Bring that bill to the floor. Yet everybody understands that, when you combine all three elements, this is a poison pill designed to kill that legislation.

After everything is said and done, all of this comes down to one simple fact: Will Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader of the U.S. Senate, allow this body to vote on a bill which will provide \$2,000 per person to working-class families all across this country? That is what this whole debate is about. It is not whether you like the bill or you don't like it. We can have that debate. We have 3 days left in this Congress. The House did the right thing. It is now time for the Senate to have that vote.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 3 p.m. today, Thursday, December 31, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 645, H.R. 9051, to provide a \$2,000 direct payment to the working class; that the bill be considered read a third time and the Senate vote on the passage of the bill;

and that if passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; further, that following the vote on H.R. 9051, the Senate resume consideration of the veto message on H.R. 6395, the National Defense Authorization Act, and the Senate vote on the passage of the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, all with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I would like to for a moment just reflect on where we are at this session of the U.S. Senate and the choices that have been made.

I want to thank Senator SANDERS and Senator SCHUMER for bringing this, with clarity, to the floor of the Senate.

We support \$2,000 as a helping hand to people across the United States. There is a limitation on the amount that individuals receive if they make more than \$75,000 or if their family makes more than \$150,000, but we are following the template that has been employed both with the CARES Act and with our own COVID relief act of just a few days ago.

We have been told by the Department of the Treasury that if you want to put money into the hands of Americans who desperately need it, this is the best way to do it, the quickest way to do it. There are better ways, I am sure, but in a time of crisis, we need to respond and respond in a timely way.

So Senator SANDERS and Senator SCHUMER have brought to the floor for consideration, we hope, a bill that has already passed the House of Representatives. The significance of this is that the House is now in recess and not scheduled to return in this congressional session. So whatever happens over here cannot be a new bill—there is no House to send it to and no time to pass it—but, rather, has to be an up-or-down vote on a bill that has passed the House as is. That is what they have come to the floor now for 3 straight days asking.

Senator SCHUMER has asked repeatedly of Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, a simple request: Whether you are for the House bill or against the House bill, allow the Senate to be the Senate. Allow us to vote on the bill—for those of us who support it, to vote on it.

It isn't a lock; it isn't guaranteed that we are going to win and prevail with that vote. There are 48 Democratic Senators, and you need 60 votes. We need help from the other side. Four or five Republican Senators say they support it as well, but we don't know if we have the 12, if all of our Members can be here. In this era of COVID-19, sadly, even some of our Senators have illnesses in the family, which may make it impossible for them to be here. So there is no guarantee we win, but there will be a guarantee that we are recorded and our positions are known to the voters across America. That is a simple request. Yet, time and again, the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, has said no.

I am worried about what is happening to this institution, not just in this instance but with what we have seen over the past several years.

We will conclude this calendar year having voted on the floor of this U.S. Senate 29 times on amendments—29 in the course of a year in what is supposedly the world's greatest deliberative body. I guess I shouldn't complain—it is a 30-percent increase over last year, when we voted on 22 amendments in the entire calendar year. The Senate is out of business and out to lunch when it comes to legislating, and that is a fact.

All we are asking for is the chance to legislate a \$2,000 helping hand to families across America. I have heard over and over again that we are just trying to featherbed the rich, that we are trying to give big checks to rich people. Well, Senator SANDERS made a point on that earlier. Less than 1 percent of the money we are asking for is going to go to the top 5 percent.

When it came time for tax policy and tax breaks, many of the people complaining the loudest about \$2,000 were giving away millions of dollars to the richest people in America without any hesitation. Well, today is another day, and today is a different America. Today, we are facing a country that is in the depths of the crisis created by COVID-19. The numbers coming back to us every night on the news are heartbreaking numbers.

I understand—and most of us do—that those wonderful women and men who are in the healthcare business usually are very stoic and calm in reporting the reality of their lives. Not so anymore. More and more doctors and nurses are breaking down on television as they describe the scenes in emergency rooms across this country. They describe the reality of telling families that they cannot be by the bedside of one of their loved ones who is about to die, and they break down in tears and tell us they don't know how much more of this they can take.

That is the reality of America. It is not an America of vastly rich people sitting by the swimming pool hoping Congress sends them more money; it is an America of those patients and their families and the people who are out of

work and the business men and women who have lost everything, who need a hand from this government.

If there is one thing about America, I hope it is clear, no matter what your political persuasion, we are a caring people. If a hurricane hits Florida, I care about it. If a tornado hits the State of Nebraska, I care about it. And we come together on a bipartisan basis to help those families. Now more than ever, those families need us to do something significant in their lives. How can you see the scenes on television every night of the parade of cars lined up in Texas, in Kentucky, in Illinois, hoping they can get some food to give to their families? Are those grifters and chiselers who are just trying to get a free meal? I don't think so. Would you sit in your car for an hour or two for food unless you really needed it? I think those people really need it. Many of them are heartbroken that they are in this situation. Some are even embarrassed—and they shouldn't be—that they have been the victims of this economy.

So all we are asking, Senator McCONNELL, is, give us a chance to vote. You can vote no if you wish. Give us a chance to vote for the \$2,000 that can make a difference in a person's life; \$4,000 for a husband and wife who are struggling to get by—rent checks, mortgage payments, car payments, utility bills, things that really are basic to families' survival. We are trying to help, and I think we should be given that chance.

We have tried time and again. We have the support of President Trump in this effort, and I am glad to have it. I think we have enough support in this Chamber to come up with 60 votes. I pray that we will, if we are given that chance, and I hope the Senate Republican leader is not afraid of that outcome. He shouldn't be.

He has two of his incumbent Republican Senators in a runoff election who have both publicly said they want to vote for this, and yet he stops them. He is the one who has put an end to their opportunity. Why? Shouldn't he give them the opportunity to vote yes? He even refuses, in this situation, with this looming election, to bring this matter to the floor for an honest up-or-down, bipartisan vote.

I listened to the stories that were told by Senator SANDERS and others about the plight of people in this country and how much they count on us and, frankly, how many of them have given up on us. They just don't believe the Congress of the United States is in touch with the reality of America.

If we are in touch with the reality in our home States, in our home towns, we should do something—something significant—to end this year on the right note.

I plead with the Republican leader, who has the power. The sole Member of Congress of 100 Members—he has the power to bring this matter to a vote and to do it immediately, within the

hour. We could call the Members who returned to Washington yesterday together, take a vote soon, in a matter of minutes, and know once and for all whether we have the 60 votes that are necessary to pass this measure. Then we can pass the override of the President's veto of the Defense authorization bill—a critical piece of legislation.

That would be the right way to end this year. Let us not end it in suspense as to whether or not we are going to come to the aid and assistance of American families who rely on us time and again to be there when America needs a helping hand. Let's do our job. Let's fill this Chamber with Senators who will actually vote on an issue that makes a difference in the lives of Americans. That is what we were elected to do. We have no excuse if we fail. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, we are here in the waning hours of 2020, expectant and hopeful about the coming year, and I want to wish all of my colleagues a very healthy and happy new year in the hope that we will fulfill the promise of our constituents, our country, our Constitution in moving forward to meet and conquer the pandemic that still ravages our Nation and to renew our economy that still is failing.

We are the greatest Nation in the history of the world, and Americans are hurting. This body has taken positive and important steps toward meeting this public health and economic crisis, as well as the hurt and harm that continue to plague Americans.

In a number of important relief packages, we have helped to meet those needs and enabled the Nation to bridge the gap created by this pandemic—an economic gap that has become a chasm, a cliff that seems without end and, for many of our fellow citizens, a time of unparalleled and unanticipated pain.

The relief package that we passed most recently—I think we can be proud to say—is the second largest in our Nation's history, and it will provide a second round of paycheck protection loans, forgivable, becoming grants, so that small businesses can keep their doors open; more aid for our transportation and education systems; money to distribute the vaccine that will be a lifesaver for so many Americans; and other important aid, including a \$600 stimulus payment for every American who is making less than \$75,000. That is real assistance for a family of four—\$2,400—because every child, as well as adult, will receive that money.

But all of that \$906 billion is only a downpayment. It is a life raft, and it has to be followed by an even more robust, bigger, bolder package to provide real relief and sustenance for the survival of our economy and, literally, the survival of Americans who are struggling to put food on the table and to buy medicine, pay rent and mortgages, clothe their children.

We have all told our stories on the floor of the Senate during 2020 about constituents waiting in food lines, hurting for the funds needed to stay in their home or apartment and to pay for the medicine that is literally a matter of life and death.

We have told those stories. We have talked about Americans who are struggling. We have the opportunity now to do something about it, so I appeal to my Republican colleague very bluntly and simply: Give us a vote on the CASH Act. Let us vote on a stand-alone \$2,000 stimulus payment bill. Allow every one of us to go on record on that \$2,000 stimulus payment bill that would add \$1,400 to that \$600 already provided—not to minimize the importance of \$600, but it is inadequate. It is insufficient. It is unacceptable because it fails to provide the basic needs to meet the desperate and dire straits of so many Americans.

We are talking about families who need that money to buy bread and milk, paper towels and toilet paper, goods and services that are necessary to the survival of their families. Six hundred dollars is simply not enough, and that is why I call on my fellow colleagues to persuade their leaders that we should be permitted this vote, because I believe that if there is a vote, it will pass. Having spoken to Republican colleagues here, I have no doubt—none—that the stand-alone \$2,000 stimulus payment measure would pass overwhelmingly, just as did the \$600 payment as part of the larger bill.

The simple fact is, that measure is the only viable vehicle. Any other measure loaded with other provisions, whether it is the section 230 reform or a commission to investigate the last election on fictitious fraud, is doomed. It is doomed logistically. It is doomed legally and physically. There is no way for the House to pass it.

Only the House bill, if passed, can provide Americans with the \$2,000 stimulus payment that they so desperately need. Only the House bill provides that relief. Any other measure will be doomed because the House cannot come back to pass it in the time we have left in this session. So the majority leader is essentially blocking a step that will literally save lives, supported by the vast majority of the American people, a significant part of his own conference, and every Democrat.

Have no doubt—every Democrat will vote for it. We clamored for a higher stimulus payment for months when the majority leader refused to come to the table and then when the President of the United States failed to lift a finger—he was on the golf course—when it

might have made a difference in raising that \$600 amount higher during the negotiating.

Looking forward, there is a way to provide this relief to Americans without leaving here in a contest of blame but in a new year of mutual congratulation. Pass the \$2,000 stimulus payment plan as a stand-alone, clean bill.

I just want to say that I am probably the only Senator who has supported two measures—one of them actually passed by the Congress and signed by the President to reform section 230 and the other unanimously voted out of the Judiciary Committee. They reformed section 230, and I support reforming section 230. I have hardly been uncritical of section 230. There should be major reform of section 230, but it has to be done in a careful, deliberate, and considered way as a separate measure, not as a meat ax in a totally unrelated bill, the \$2,000 payment bill that provides real relief for the country.

Loading the CASH Act with poison pills is obstruction. It is not constructive legislating, and it fails to meet the test of this moment. It is vital that we move forward to provide struggling Americans with this relief, and scuttling the \$2,000 stimulus payment bill with a half-baked, meat-ax evisceration of section 230 is cruel and downright stupid. It betrays the mission and obligation that we have in these waning days of 2020.

Americans need more help, and they need hope. Help and hope are embodied in the vaccine. Unfortunately, the rollout of this vaccine, despite the \$8 billion contained in the latest pandemic relief bill, has been hopelessly behind schedule. The number of doses distributed is roughly one-tenth of what it should be even under the scaled-back schedule that this administration has adopted. Twenty million vaccinations were promised by the end of the year. That number was way below the initial promise, and only about one-tenth of them—probably 2 million—will actually be provided.

Instead of taking responsibility or taking control, President Trump is still tweeting; instead of action, more talk. Only action will save lives, and either he doesn't care enough, or he doesn't really see what is necessary to do in order to save these lives, because the distribution of this vaccine is a matter of life and death.

Using the Defense Production Act, mobilizing America, making sure States have the resources they need, providing money to hospitals, and making sure there are the vials, syringes, training for workers, as well as the facilities to transport, store, and distribute this vaccine, are essential now. They are missing at this moment, and the President is where the buck stops.

Now I look forward to a 2021 when a new President will expand the stimulus payments to individuals and when many of the other gaps left unfinished—action that still is necessary—

will be fulfilled by another, more robust, bigger, bolder pandemic relief program. I hope we will have the same bipartisan support that we saw at the end of this year for the latest. I hope we will overcome the divisions that prevented us from doing what is really necessary and adding \$1,400 to the \$600 already provided.

We need to do more for small businesses. Yes, there will be another round of PPP payments, but this chasm faced by restaurants, retailers, and small businesses struggling to keep their doors open, keep their people on payroll during the holidays—we have seen them all and talked to them. Their stories are riveting and heart-breaking. Businesspeople have poured their hearts and souls and lives into these businesses, only to see them threatened with extinction.

This crisis has a racial justice aspect that cannot be ignored because disproportionately, the businesses that have failed are Black- and Brown-owned. Disproportionately, the lives lost have been in Black and Brown communities. Disproportionately, the jobs lost have been in those same communities—Black and Brown communities that have suffered more than any other as a result of this pandemic. So we need to make sure that they receive the vaccine as well as the therapeutics and testing that are necessary to save lives.

We are in the midst of a racial justice moment that affects policing and criminal justice, but it also affects our schools, where the ZIP Code of a child's residence can mean the difference between a quality education or not; where Black and Brown communities suffer twice or three times the death rate of others as a result of this pandemic; where job discrimination still exists and where, in housing, redlining still afflicts these communities; and where environmental quality—rivers, lakes, air can still be disproportionately contaminated and polluted in communities inhabited by Black and Brown people.

We are here in the last day of an unprecedented and catastrophic year. More than 342,000 of our fellow Americans are dead as a result of this insidious virus—over 342,000 gifts unwrapped, places at the table left open, and many of them without a final goodbye. This past year will go down as one of the hardest in our history.

I think we all hope for a better year, but it will come only if we take the kind of action that apparently my Republican colleagues are failing to provide today, which is to meet the need to match the moment of the desperate and dire straits of so many Americans.

The failure to approve an additional \$1,400 and pass the CASH Act is a haunting omission. My hope is that the hopes of a hurting nation will be met in this new year, that the calls for justice and relief will be heard, and that the ailing and sick—not just physically but emotionally—will be met. This cri-

sis has been one of physical health care but also mental health care, and the emotional strains can be seen in the rising rates of domestic violence, substance abuse disorder and addiction, and so many other areas where mental and emotional stress and anxiety have taken a toll. The hopes of a fearful and grieving nation rests on our shoulders, and we cannot let them down.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

TRIBUTE TO GARY HERBERT

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I stand today to honor my friend Gary Herbert, Governor of the State of Utah for the last 12 years, who, after a long career in public service, is now embarking on a really well-deserved, hard-earned retirement.

He served the State of Utah and has done so with great enthusiasm and dedication and spirit, and I am grateful to have worked alongside him throughout his tenure serving our great State.

Gary Herbert was born in American Fork, UT, and grew up in Orem. He served a 2-year mission for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints on the east coast and later attended Brigham Young University, my alma mater.

He first began his public service in college, serving in the Utah Army National Guard for 6 years and eventually becoming a staff sergeant. After his time in the National Guard, he set up a real estate firm and was very successful, eventually becoming the president of the Utah Association of Realtors. He also served as president of the Utah Association of Counties, by the way.

Starting in 1990, he served as a commissioner on the Utah County Commission. He served there for 14 years, and it was at that point that he began his statewide service within Utah. You see, in 2004, when Jon Huntsman ran for the Governor's seat, Gary became his running mate, running alongside Huntsman as his Lieutenant Governor, with the pair going on to win the race in November.

It was then that I first got to know Gary Herbert personally, when I was hired to be Governor Huntsman's general counsel. One of my first memories of Gary Herbert—which, to me, seems like it was just the day before yesterday—occurred when we all began moving into the Governor's office suite, just the day before Herbert and Huntsman were sworn into office.

Gary came in and provided us all with a warm welcome, but he didn't stop at the welcome. He offered really sound and heartfelt advice about the importance of staying grounded as we were entering the political fray. He explained that long after our service and the Huntsman-Herbert administration expired, we want to be able to look back and be pleased about the relationships that we had formed with each other, but especially the relationships